



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|

09/030,258 02/25/98 SCHULTZ

R 12217-100

027267 TM02/0725
WIGGIN & DANA LLP
ATTENTION: PATENT DOCKETING
ONE CENTURY TOWER, P.O. BOX 1832
NEW HAVEN CT 06508-1832

EXAMINER

LAO.S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED:

07/25/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/030,258

Applicant(s)

Schultz, et al

Examiner

S. Lao

Group Art Unit
2151

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gregory S. Rosenblatt

(3) Richard K. Schultz

(2) Michael K. Kinney

(4) Ashish S. Deshpande

Date of Interview Jul 24, 2001

(5) Charles M. Newman

(6) Alvin Oberley

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy is given to 1) ☒ Applicant 2) ☐ Applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

PROPOSED

Claim(s) discussed: 1-3

Identification of prior art discussed:

Krishnamurthy, Mahajan,

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ Was reached. g) ☒ Was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

It was agreed that the proposed claim 1 would define over the prior art of record provided that it further includes the language of a first and second decision which allows the instructions in the script to be executed by different processing modules. It was also agreed that the proposed claims 2 and 3 would define over the art on record if similar language of first and second decision is included. Further search and consideration is required.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.